Prince George's County Planning Board | Office of the Chairman

1616 McCormick Drive, Largo, MD 20774 301-952-3561 pgcpb@ppd.mncppc.org www.pgplanningboard.org

October 16, 2025

The Honorable Edward P. Burroughs, III Chair, Prince George's County Council Wayne K. Curry Administration Building 1301 McCormick Drive Largo, MD 20774

RE: LDR-153-2025

Dear Chair Burroughs:

As required by the County's legislative amendment process for amendments to the Zoning Ordinance (Section 27-3501), the Planning Board held a public hearing on October 16, 2025, to receive comments on proposed Legislative Drafting Request LDR-153-2025.

During discussion of LDR-153-2025, the Planning Board approved a motion adopting the findings contained in the Planning Department Technical Staff Report. This motion constituted a Planning Board recommendation for the proposed legislation of NO POSITION.

Hearing Summary:

At the hearing six (6) speakers provided public testimony on the bill:

- Cheryl Corr spoke in opposition to the bill. Ms. Corr emphasized that the PD Zone
 approach would be more suitable for the sites within the FPO Zone. Ms. Corr also called
 for improved mechanisms to assess the adequacy of these sites and raised concerns about
 the overlay, particularly regarding the AR zone.
- Geoffrey Collins spoke in opposition primarily because of the unchecked authority over major site decisions. Mr. Collins highlighted that the process lacked environmental safeguards and community engagement. Mr. Collins also emphasized the need to reintegrate detailed site plans into the review process to enhance community involvement and County Council oversight. Additionally, Mr. Collins called for the inclusion of enforcement mechanisms in the mitigation agreements to ensure substantial public benefits.
- Maureen Fine spoke in opposition. Ms. Fine opposition is due to potential developments
 that lack a site plan review and public input. Ms. Fine is particularly concerned about the
 Six Flags site, which is a significant biodiverse area that needs protection. Given its
 proximity to the Belt Woods Natural Environment Area, any development in this location
 would require substantial input from environmental experts.

- Greg Smith spoke in opposition to the bill and aligned his comments with the testimony
 provided by various organizations. Mr. Smith expressed concern that the bill undermines
 the public's ability to submit comments to the Planning Board and highlighted the lack of
 clarity regarding potential sites.
- Janet Gingold, a neighbor of the Six Flags site, also spoke in opposition. Ms. Gingold echoed Ms. Fine's concerns about the vulnerability of the Belt Woods. Ms. Gingold argued that the bill fails to protect the environment, enforce regulations, and engage the community effectively. Ms. Gingold believes the legislation should demonstrate best practices for sustainability.
- Melissa Schweisguth also spoke against the bill, stating that bypassing the detailed site
 plan review removes the opportunity for public input, particularly for projects that have
 environmental sensitivity. Ms. Schweisguth emphasized that developing sites in the
 overlay as mixed-use TAC would contribute to additional sprawl in the County.

Planning Board Proposed Amendments:

Following review of LDR-153-2025, the Department proposed the following amendments with which the Planning Board concurs:

Page 7, lines 20-31 and page 8, lines 1-6:

(B) The District Council establishes the FPO Zone on all land in Prince George's County that meets one or more of the following criteria:

(i) A tract of contiguous land, INCLUDING LAND SEPARATED BY ANY RIGHTS-OF-WAY OR EASEMENTS in common ownership at least 200 150 acres in size within one or more of the Town Activity Center-CORE (TAC-C) Zone, TOWN ACTIVITY CENTER-EDGE (TAC-E) ZONE, Legacy Comprehensive Design (LCD) Zone, AND/or the Agricultural-Residential Zone that permitted-IN ACTIVE USE AS one or more of the following uses ON JANUARY 1, 2025: commercial recreational attraction, amusement park, or arena, stadium, or amphitheater, on January 1, 2025; and/or INCLUSIVE OF:

- (aa) LAND USED FOR PARKING FOR SAID USE; AND/OR
 (bb) UTILITY EASEMENTS AND/OR RIGHTS-OF-WAY ABUTTING
 SAID USE; AND/OR
- (cc) LAND WITHIN THE SAME TAX ACCOUNT AS SAID USE(S) ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2025; AND/OR
- (dd) LAND OWNED BY THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION NOT CLASSIFIED IN THE RESERVED OPEN SPACE (ROS) ZONE.

(ii) At least 50 contiguous acres LAND classified in the REGIONAL TRANSIT-ORIENTED, LOW, CORE (RTO-L-C), REGIONAL TRANSIT-ORIENTED, LOW, EDGE (RTO-L-E), Local Transit-Oriented, Core (LTO-C) Zone or Local Transit-Oriented Edge (LTO-E) Zone within one mile of a tract of land that meets the requirements of (i) above.

Legislative Amendment Decision Standards:

The advisability of amending the text of this Ordinance is a matter committed to the legislative discretion of the County Council sitting as the District Council and is not controlled by any one factor. Within each zone listed in the Classes of Zones (Section 27-4102), the district council may regulate the construction, alteration, and uses of buildings and structures and the uses of land, including surface, subsurface, and air rights. The provisions for each zone shall be uniform for each class or kind of development throughout the zone, and no legislative amendment may create different standards for a subset of properties within a zone, unless such standards are necessary to implement development policies within the applicable Area Master Plan, Sector Plan, development policies of the General Plan, or other approved development district; however, any differentiation of a subset of properties within a zone shall be reasonable and based upon the public policy to be served.

The Department finds that LDR-153-2025 provides for uniform treatment for each class or kind of development throughout the overlay zone. The establishment of a new overlay zone will introduce disparate standards for a subset of properties within an underlying Euclidean Zone on a Countywide basis as a supplement, rather than to replace, the existing provisions and specific standards applicable to each underlying zone.

In addition, properties located within the FPO Zone will remain subject to the general development standards applicable to the underlying base zone. Therefore, the proposed overlay zone will not alter the uniformity of the development standards applicable in the underlying zones, but instead will work in conjunction with existing regulations to provide additional or specialized requirements where necessary.

As always, Planning Department staff members are available to work with the Council and your legislative staff on any pertinent legislative matters. Please let us know if we may be of further assistance.

Sincerely

Should you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of the Planning Director at 301-952-3594. Thank you again, for your consideration.

Darryl Barnes Chairman